

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE MIDDLE DISTRICT OF PENNSYLVANIA**

<b>THOMAS S. WASHAM,</b>	:	<b>CIVIL ACTION NO. 1:13-CV-052</b>
<b>Petitioner</b>	:	
	:	<b>(Judge Conner)</b>
<b>v.</b>	:	
	:	
<b>JUDGE JAMES F. PROUD, et al.,</b>	:	
<b>Respondents</b>	:	

**ORDER**

AND NOW, this 1st day of February, 2013, upon consideration of the Report and Recommendation of United States Judge Martin C. Carlson (Doc. 6), recommending that this case be transferred to the United States District Court for the Eastern District of Pennsylvania, and, following an independent review of the record, and noting that petitioner filed objections<sup>1</sup> to the report on January 23, 2013 (Doc. 7), and the court finding Judge Carlson's analysis to be thorough and well-reasoned, and the court finding petitioner's objections to be without merit and squarely addressed by Judge Carlson's report (Doc. 6), it is hereby ORDERED that:

---

<sup>1</sup> Where objections to a magistrate judge's report and recommendation are filed, the court must perform a *de novo* review of the contested portions of the report. Supinski v. United Parcel Serv., Civ. A. No. 06-0793, 2009 WL 113796, at \*3 (M.D. Pa. Jan. 16, 2009) (citing Sample v. Diecks, 885 F.2d 1099, 1106 n. 3 (3d Cir. 1989); 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)(c)). "In this regard, Local Rule of Court 72.3 requires 'written objections which . . . specifically identify the portions of the proposed findings, recommendations or report to which objection is made and the basis for those objections.'" Id. (citing Shields v. Astrue, Civ. A. No. 07-417, 2008 WL 4186951, at \*6 (M.D. Pa. Sept. 8, 2008)).

1. The Report and Recommendation of Judge Carlson (Doc. 6) are ADOPTED.
2. The Clerk of Court is directed to TRANSFER this case to the United States District Court for the Eastern District of Pennsylvania pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 2241(d).
3. The Clerk of Court is directed to CLOSE this case.

S/ Christopher C. Conner  
CHRISTOPHER C. CONNER  
United States District Judge